

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. 10003930-1

Inventors: A. Wiechers et al.

Confirmation Number: 6165

Serial No.: 09/816,816

Examiner: William D. Hutton, Jr.

Filed: 3/22/01

Group Art Unit: 2176

Title: DOCUMENT PROCESSING SYSTEMS WITH SCANNING REVIEW CAPABILITY

REPLY BRIEF

Sturgeon does not teach determining if a page is properly "aligned" when that term is properly construed in light of the Specification.

Claim 23 recites determining if the scanned page was properly aligned for scanning. Claims 1, 14, 28, 30 and 35 recite similar limitations.

One specific example of a page that is not properly aligned is given in the Specification. In this example, described in the Specification with reference to Figs. 5 and 6 at page 12, lines 1-4, the selected registration characteristic is the left margin. Proper alignment is designated by the left margin reference line 522. (Reference line 522 is shown in both Figs. 5 and 6 but it is only enumerated in Fig. 5.) Fig. 6 shows that the left margin of page 602 is offset to the right of left margin reference line 522. Accordingly, the Specification quite properly states that page 602 in Fig. 6 "has been provided to the scanner in an improper position, e.g., the left margin of page 602 is not properly aligned with reference line 522."

Reference to alignment is made in only two other places in the Specification. The full paragraph for each reference is included in the quotes below so that the context in which term is used will be apparent.

"As depicted in FIG. 2, the document processing system or method 10 may be construed as beginning at block 202 where selection of a registration characteristic is enabled. By way of example, such a registration characteristic may include page number, top line, bottom line, left side margin, right side margin, or any other feature(s) of a page to be scanned that may be utilized for determining proper **alignment** of the page **relative to the scanner**. In block 204, review of the page(s) to be scanned relative to the selected registration characteristic may be

facilitated. For instance, assuming that the registration characteristic of the top line has been selected, review of the pages to be scanned may include determining whether the top line of each page is appropriately positioned for scanning, e.g., whether the top line of each page is properly positioned **relative to one or more components of the scanner** so that a proper scanned image corresponding to the page may be acquired." Specification page 5, lines 7-18 (emphasis added).

* * *

"Proceeding to block 206, correction of the page(s) not properly exhibiting the selected registration characteristic is enabled. For instance, if, during the review of a page, it is determined that the registration characteristic of that page does not correspond, e.g., is not properly **aligned**, with the selected registration characteristic, correction of the page may be facilitated. In some embodiments, enabling correction of the page(s) may include providing an operator with an indication that the page(s) is not properly registered. Thus, in response to receiving such notification, the operator may attempt to properly register the page at that time so that the scanning process may continue. In other embodiments, the scanning process may continue, e.g., scanning of subsequent pages may be initiated, and the improperly registered page may be designated for review and/or scanning at a later time." Specification page 6, lines 7-17.

The references to alignment on pages 5 and 12 of the Specification, noted above, clearly suggest alignment refers to how the page is positioned on the scanner. The reference to alignment on page 6 of the Specification, also noted above, says only that alignment is one example of a correspondence between registration characteristics. None of these passages support the Examiner's assertion that alignment should be construed broadly to include Sturgeon's use of page designations to: collate pages in a scanned document when the scanning page order is not the same as the desired document page order (column 6, lines 31-34 and column 7, lines 9-13); determine inconsistencies in the orientation of pages in a scanned document (column 6, lines 37-53); and compare the total number of pages scanned with a desired or anticipated number of pages (column 8, lines 49-52). (In Sturgeon, so-called "misfed" pages are identified "by comparing the number of pages actually scanned to a desired or predetermined number." Sturgeon, column 5, lines 54-57.)

Indeed, missing and out-of-sequence page determinations are explicitly distinguished from alignment in the Specification and in the Claims. See, for example, Specification page 9, lines 16-20 and Claim 16 depending from Claim 14.

Finally, the claims as originally filed were not limited to determining proper alignment. The alignment limitation was added during prosecution to distinguish references cited by the Examiner. Thus, the prosecution history is also not consistent with the Examiner's broad interpretation of alignment.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Appellants
Reg. No. 35,974
(208) 433-1991